

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/723,955	11/26/2003	Ruoping Chen	7.US29.CON	3273
34132 75	590 10/10/2006		EXAMINER	
COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C. 1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508		·	BASI, NIRMAL SINGH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	,		1646	
			DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	10/723,955	CHEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nirmal S. Basi	1646				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence a	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	1 November 2004					
· — · — · — · — — — — — — — — — — — — —	This action is non-final.	•				
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	<b>,</b>					
·	-4'					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) 33-59 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
· ·	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
	•					
8) Claim(s) 33-59 are subject to restriction and	a/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 (	CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form P	PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents have been	n received in this Nationa	al Stage			
application from the International Bu	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	t received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)  Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/723,955

Art Unit: 1646

## DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 36-46, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding a non-endogenous, constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor, wherein the nucleic acid sequence encodes an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 82 that comprises a substitution of an amino acid other than an isoleucine for the isoleucine at position 225 of said amino acid sequence, vector comprising said polynucleotide, recombinant host cell comprising said vector and isolated membrane of said recombinant host cell, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
  - II. Claims 47-50, drawn to isolated non-endogenous, constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor comprising an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:82 that comprises a substitution of an amino acid other than an isoleucine for the isoleucine at position 225 of SEQ ID NO:82, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
  - III. Claims 33-35, drawn to method of using a G protein-coupled receptor of SEQ ID NO:82 to screen candidate compounds as pharmaceutical agents for a disease or disorder ameliorated by an elevation of an

intracellular level of cAMP in peripheral blood leukocytes, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

IV. Claims 51-59, drawn to a method for identifying one or more candidate compounds as a modulator of a non- endogenous, constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor, wherein said receptor comprises an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:82 that comprises a substitution of an amino acid other than an isoleucine for the isoleucine at position 225 of said amino acid sequence., classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: The polypeptide of group II and polynucleotide of group I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I does not necessarily encode a polypeptide of group II. The information provided by the polynucleotide of group I can be used to make a materially different polypeptide than that of group II, e.g. variants. For example, a nucleic acid which hybridizes to the polynucleotide encoding the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:82, even under stringent conditions, encompasses molecules which contain point mutations, splice sites, frameshift mutations or stop codons which would result in use of a different open

reading frame, and thus encode a protein that lacks any significant structure in common with SEQ ID NO. 82. In addition, while a polypeptide of group II can made by methods using some, but not all, of the polynucleotides that fall within the scope of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural source using by biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and I are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and IX have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides, which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers, which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. In addition, the polypeptide claims include polypeptides variants of the sequence identified in SEQ ID NO:82. This search requires an extensive analysis of the art retrieved in a sequence search and will require an in-depth analysis of technical literature. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups I and II together.

The compounds of Invention I and II are distinct from the methods of Invention III wherein the compounds of Invention I and II can neither be used in nor made by the methods of Invention III.

Page 5

The compounds Inventions I and II and the method of Inventions IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the compound of Invention I and II can be used for the production of antibodies.

The methods of Inventions III and IV are distinct from each other because they are independent, using separate method steps, active agents and having different effects. For example the method of group IV uses a constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor, whereas the method of Group III does not. The constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor and the non-constitutively activated version of a G protein-coupled receptor are structurally and functionally different compounds.

An election to prosecute one of the groups listed I -IV must be made.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in responding to this Office action.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C.

101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirmal S. Basi whose telephone number is 571-272-0868. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nirmal S. Basi Art Unit 1646

10/2/06

ELIZABETH KEMMERER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Elyaber C. Kemmen